

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,532	MEGLEY, SEAN M.
	Examiner Yemane Mesfin	Art Unit 2444

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yemane Mesfin.

(3) David Christianson, for Assignee.

(2) Faustino Lichauco (Attorney for applicant).

(4) Sean Megley, Inventor.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Jacobson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the claimed invention and the applied prior art of record. Applicant explained the claimed invention and how it differs from the teachings of Jacobson, which is related to e-mail rule compliance of a user. Examiner proposed further search and consideration to properly determine patentability determination.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Yemane Mesfin/
Examiner, Art Unit 2444